

[13th November 1922]

Communal representation in the Central Survey Office.

448 Q.—Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that no non-Brahman was appointed to any of the two posts of Assistant Director of Survey in the Central Survey Office, Madras, since 1909; and

(b) if so, why neither of the two non-Brahman Assistant Directors in field was appointed to the vacancy of second Assistant that recently occurred in the Central Survey Office?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) No vacancy occurred recently in the Central Survey Office.

Nomination to the taluk boards of South Arcot.

449 Q.—Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether Messrs. Padmanaba Reddiyar and Chinnaswami Pillai nominated to the taluk boards of Cuddalore and Tirukkōyilūr, respectively, actually stood for election and were defeated;

(2) whether it is usual to nominate to the local boards persons defeated at the polls; and

(3) the reason for nominating (a) Messrs. Padmanaba Reddiyar and R. K. Venugopal Nayudu to the Cuddalore taluk board notwithstanding the fact that six Reddis and four Nayudus had been elected to that board, (b) Mr. Chinnaswami Pillai to the Tirukkōyilūr taluk board while four Pillais had been elected thereto, and (c) Mr. Muthu Kondal Roya Reddiyar to the Vriddhachalam taluk board for which three Reddis had been elected?

A.—The Government have no information.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ May I request the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government to tell us whether he would be pleased to call for the information?”

The hon. the RAJA of PANAGAL :—“ I have no objection to call for the information.”

Election of district board members in South Arcot.

450 Q.—Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) the total number of elective seats in the district board of South Arcot and the distribution thereof among the several taluk boards;

(2) the reason for the president of the district board of South Arcot directing the taluk board presidents to hold elections in June 1922 for returning to the district board not the full strength which each taluk board was competent to do but one member less in each case; and

(3) the authority under the Local Boards Act or the rules framed thereunder permitting such restrictive direction?

13th November 1922]

A.—(1) The total number of elective seats on the district board of South Arcot is 30 and the number that has to be filled up by the taluk boards is 25 as shown below :—

Name of taluk boards.						Number of members.
Tindivanam	8
Tirukkōyilūr	6
Chidambaram	4
Cuddalore	4
Vriddhāchalam	3
Total						25

(2) Till April 1922 the thirty elective seats were held by three ex officio members, i.e., non-official presidents of taluk boards, and twenty-seven members elected by the five taluk boards. In May 1922, when the taluk boards were reconstituted under the new Act, inasmuch as the Government did not reserve to themselves the power to nominate the president of any of these five taluk boards, the number of ex officio members who should be counted towards the elective seats rose to 5 and only 25 members were returnable by the taluk boards. The reduction from 27 to 25 in the number of members to be elected involved a redistribution of these seats and pending the order of Government on this redistribution the Government understand that the President, as a matter of prudence, directed each taluk board to elect one member less than it ought to, so that even if Government should sanction a redistribution other than what was suggested by the President, the elections already held might not be affected.

(3) The answer is in the negative.

Additional Subordinate Judge's Court at Cocanada.

451 Q.—Diwan Bahadur K. SURYANARAYANAMURTI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that the Government contemplate the removal of the additional Subordinate Judge's Court now at Cocanada to Rajahmundry, investing the same with territorial jurisdiction over Ramachandrapuram and Rajahmundry taluks;

(2) whether it is not a fact that 87 out of 117 villages of Ramachandrapuram taluk have been always within the jurisdiction of the Cocanada Subordinate Judge's Court;

(3) whether the Government are aware that the litigants of the Ramachandrapuram taluk feel Cocanada to be more convenient by reason of

(i) its easier access;

(ii) Cocanada being the centre of export trade;

(iii) greater accommodation and better sanitation;

(4) whether it is a fact that the Government contemplate a redistribution of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Gōdāvari and Kistna districts and the same will necessitate a re-adjustment of civil jurisdiction;